

web components are objects that store both the server-end code and data for the web page. *McCartney* is relied upon in an effort to remedy this deficiency.

As discussed in Applicants' previous response, *Kitayama* discloses a technique in which a server receives a display request from a terminal and a response to the display request, the server generates a group of data objects. The data objects are associated with the content of the display and are independent of the requesting terminal. A group of view objects is generated using the group of data objects and information concerning the attributes of the requesting terminal. Each view object includes information related to display control.

McCartney discloses a system and method for dynamically publishing XML-documents for different clients. Here, when a client request is received, the client capabilities are determined and an XSL-style sheet based on the capabilities is selected. Next, an XML-content document is selected based on the document requested by the client. The selected style sheet and the selected content document are then merged and an XML-compliant document is created. This document is then transmitted to the client.

The Examiner alleges that the XSL-style sheet and/or the XML-content document are analogous to Applicants' claimed web components. However, as provided in claim 1, the web components are **objects** which store both the server-end code and data for the web page. Given the guidance provided by *McCartney*, one of ordinary skill would understand, that the XSL -style sheet and the XSL - content document are not objects. Rather, both are text based documents, which do not embody the characteristics of an object as provided in Applicants' claims.

Regarding claim 12, *Kitayama* discloses that various child view objects are used to generate parts of an HTML document of their responsibility. See *Kitayama*, pgph [0079]. *Kitayama*, however, does not disclose that the various child view objects produce representations for **different client types**, as recited in claim 12.

As noted above, *McCartney* discloses the use of two text-based documents to generate a web-based document for a particular client format. As such, neither *McCartney* nor *Kitayama* teach or suggest that a web page includes web components that produce representations for **different client types**, as recited in claim 12. Stated differently, the applied art does not disclose that objects associated with different client presentations formats are included in the same web page. Rather, at best the combination of *McCartney* and *Kitayama* teaches that only those objects used to generate a portion of a document are included in that document.

In summary, *Kitayama* and *McCartney* when applied individually or collectively fail to disclose or suggest every feature and/or the combination of features recited in independent claims 1 and 12. For these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Thus, withdrawal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is deemed appropriate and hereby respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-19 are allowable and as a result this application is deemed to be in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner believe that any remaining and unresolved issues can be addressed through a personal interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 6, 2010

By: /Shawn B. Cage/
Shawn B. Cage
Registration No. 51522

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620